

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

ANN R. RUPLI

Plaintiff,

v.

**MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC
REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC.**

Defendant.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Civil Case No.: RWT 11-0287

ORDER

Upon consideration of Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings [ECF No. 24], Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings [ECF No. 27], the Plaintiff's response thereto "abandoning her Motion for a Judgment on the Pleadings" [ECF No. 28], and the Court concluding that Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings is premature because Defendant has not yet filed an answer,¹ it is this 11th day of April 2011, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland,

ORDERED, that Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings [ECF No. 24] is **DENIED**; and it is further

ORDERED, Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings [ECF No. 27] is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

/s/

ROGER W. TITUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ See e.g., *Little v. Fed. Bureau of Investigation*, 793 F. Supp. 652, 653 (D. Md. 1992), *aff'd* 1 F.3d 255 (4th Cir. 1993) ("[A] motion for judgment on the pleadings is plainly inappropriate here, because the pleadings have not been closed by answers from all defendants.")